REPORT RESUMES

ED 018 557 VT 001 090

A STUDY OF FACTORS IN WORKERS' DECISIONS TO FOREGO RETRAINING UNDER MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962.

BY- BRAZZIEL, WILLIAM F.
VIRGINIA STATE COLL., NORFOLK DIV.

PUB DATE JUN 64
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$2.60 63P.

DESCRIPTORS- *RETRAINING, INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS, MALES, EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND, QUESTIONNAIRES, EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS, AGE, RACIAL CHARACTERISTICS, COMMUNICATION PROBLEMS, EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCE, EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS, MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT, VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, *UNEMPLOYED, *UNSKILLED WORKERS, *ENROLLMENT INFLUENCES, *PROGRAM ATTITUDES, JOB PLACEMENT, *EDUCATIONAL ATTITUDES, ATTITUDE TESTS, EMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS, MDTA PROGRAMS, VIRGINIA,

THE VIRGINIA EMPLOYMENT COMMISSION IDENTIFIED AND CONTACTED 314 MEN FOR ENROLLMENT IN RETRAINING PROGRAMS. THESE MEN, AGES 21 TO 65, WERE COMPARED ON THE BASIS OF THEIR ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF ENROLLMENT IN THE PROGRAMS. THE PROGRAMS WERE (1) A 52-WEEK COURSE IN BRICK MASONRY, AUTOMOBILE MECHANICS, SHEET METAL WORK, ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY, OR BUILDING MAINTENANCE AND (2) A 12-WEEK COURSE IN AUTOMOBILE SERVICING. DATA WERE COLLECTED BY INTERVIEW TO TEST 10 HYPOTHESES, THREE OF WHICH WERE--(1) THE REJECTORS FEEL TRAINING ALLOWANCES ARE TOO LOW, (2) COMMUNICATIONS DO NOT ADEQUATELY CONVEY THE REQUIREMENTS FOR ENROLLMENT OR THE POTENTIAL BENEFITS, AND (3) EDUCATION, TRAINING, WORK EXPERIENCE, AND FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS DIFFER FOR ENROLLERS AND REJECTORS. THE THREE MAJOR FACTORS WHICH DETERRED ENROLLMENT WERE (1) THE TRAINING ALLOWANCE OF $25 PER WEEK WAS TOO LOW, (2) THE TRAINING PERIOD WAS TOO LONG, AND (3) COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING THE COURSES AND ENROLLMENT IMPEDED RECRUITMENT. OTHER FINDINGS INDICATED THE REJECTOR HAD SELDOM BEEN IN MILITARY SERVICE, HAD NOT WORKED OUTSIDE HIS HOME COMMUNITY, AND HAD NOT WORKED WITH OR NEAR SKILLED WORKERS. HE SEEMED PRONE TO MISUNDERSTAND INFORMATION ABOUT NEW PROGRAMS. HE ALSO FELT HE COULD NOT AFFORD A LONG PERIOD OF RETRAINING. SOME RECOMMENDATIONS WERE TO--(1) UTILIZE LONG RANGE INFORMATION PROGRAMS, (2) USE A VARIETY OF COMMUNICATION TECHNIQUES, (3) PROVIDE A DEMONSTRATION TRAINING PROJECT, (4) PROVIDE ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR LARGE FAMILIES DURING TRAINING, AND (5) USE THE SIMPLEST ENROLLMENT PROCEDURES. STATISTICAL DATA ARE INCLUDED. (EM)

ED018557

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A STUDY OF FACTORS IN WORKERS' DECISIONS TO FOREGO RETRAINING UNDER THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

William F. Brazziel
Director of General Education
Norfolk Division, Virginia State College

in cooperation with

The Office of Manpower, Automation and Training
United States Department of Labor

June 1964

T 01090

FOREWORD

This report presents the results of research completed by the Norfolk Division of Virginia State College under contract with and supported by funds from the Office of Manpower, Automation and Training, United States Department of Labor. This research sought to identify factors in the decisions of unemployed, unskilled workers to forego retraining for a higher level of skill. It attempted to gain insights concerning the choice processes by which workers decide for or against retraining, as a basis for planning future retraining programs, especially the manner in which retraining opportunities are offered to prospective trainees.

The study was completed in Norfolk, Va., in 1963. It used a combination of interview and attitude assessment techniques. Men who had rejected retraining opportunities in projects established under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and men who enrolled in these programs were the subjects. Altogether, 314 unemployed and unskilled men in the Norfolk - Portsmouth Metropolitan Labor Market Area were interviewed: 90 men who enrolled in retraining and 224 men who were offered the opportunity to enroll but who decided not to do so.

After briefly summarizing the major findings of the study, the report analyzes in detail the statistics obtained in interviews of the men who enrolled in retraining programs, as compared with those for men who rejected the opportunity to enroll. A second section of the report presents the conclusions and suggests the implications of these findings. A concluding section of the report contains tables of supporting data, together with some brief notes on methodology.

The author wishes to acknowledge the assistance of the following persons in the planning and execution of the study:

Consultants

William M. Cooper, Director
Federal Demonstration Retraining Project
Norfolk Division, Virginia State College

Paul Bryan, Manager
Norfolk Office
Virginia Employment Commission

John T. Blue, Chairman
Division of Social Science
Norfolk Division, Virginia State College

James A. Bowser
Director of the Junior College
Norfolk Division, Virginia State College

Withro McEnge
Professor of Industrial Education
Tuskegee Institute (On leave)

Leonard Solomon
Assistant Professor of Social Psychology
Boston University

Herbert Toops
Professor of Psychology
The Ohio State University

Frank Riessman
Mobilization for Youth
New York, New York

Research Personnel

Interview Specialist - Vivian Ewing
Casework Supervisor, Norfolk Social Service Bureau (On leave)

Interview Analyst - Ethelyn Strong
Assistant Professor of Sociology
Norfolk Division, Virginia State College

Chief Statistician - Moses Boseman
Associate Professor of Mathematics
Norfolk Division, Virginia State College

Statistician - Willard Stanback
Assistant Professor of Mathematics
Norfolk Division, Virginia State College

Interviewers - Interviewers were drawn from the faculty of Norfolk Division, Virginia State College and from the Norfolk Office of the Virginia Employment Commission

Editorial Assistant - Dollie P. Kuykendall

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Foreword. i

Summary of Major Findings 1

Analysis of Factors in Decisions to Forego Retraining 3
  Background of the Study. 3
    Concepts. 4
    Methods 5
  Adequacy of Communications 7
  Characteristics of Enrollers and Rejecters 10
  Reasons Given by the Men for Not Enrolling 14
  Amount of Training Allowance 16
  Location of Project. 18
  Academic Inadequacy. 19
  School and Cultural Expectations 19
  Retraining as a Form of Welfare. 20
  Reluctance to Migrate for Placement. 20
  The Economy Will Reabsorb the Unemployed 21
  Placement Difficulties After Training. 22
  Lack of Self-Reliance. 23
  Opinions Regarding Help to the Unemployed. 24

Conclusions and Recommendations 26
  Recommendations. 29

Statistical Appendix. 35
  Explanatory Notes. 35
  List of Tables 38

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS

Most of the unskilled, unemployed men who rejected training in a skilled or semiskilled occupation in two of the initial programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act were convinced they could not support their families on the $25 weekly training allowance during a year's retraining. The ban on part-time employment during training, subsequently removed, seemed to reinforce this reservation. This attitude was, however, also characteristic of those who enrolled in the training courses.

The explanation of why the small training allowance was a deterrent in one case and not in the other seems to lie in differences in the work experience of the enrollers and the rejecters. Their education and economic situation were similar. The rejecters were, however, less likely to have acquired some sophistication toward employment opportunities as a result of training in military service or work outside the Norfolk-Portsmouth area, where the programs were conducted. It is possible that they were also less likely to be predisposed toward acquiring a skill because they had less often worked with or near skilled tradesmen. Also, their more restricted experience might have made them prone to misunderstand the requirements for enrollment and the potential benefits of retraining.

These findings emerge as the major results of a study conducted in 1963 by the Norfolk Division of Virginia State College in an attempt to determine why a group of unemployed, unskilled workers decided to forego retraining under the MDTA. Other postulated differences in attitudes between those who enrolled and those who did not were found to be either nonexistent or insignificant.

Both the rejecters and the enrollers thought that returning to school for retraining would be hard for older men. Both groups also had reservations about the possibility that they would have to leave the area in order to find work after retraining. Generally, however, they did not anticipate great difficulty in finding a job in the area, if they had new skills, even though most of both groups were Negroes. Nor did the rejecters lack ambition or initiative; in fact, most of them seemed eager to find work and suggested that government retraining programs would be the best solution for unemployment. They also mentioned better job placement services, more on-the-job training by industry, and new public works programs.

All of these findings, like those of any study of a particular labor market, may have limited applicability. In the authors' judgment, however, the deterrents to retraining shown in this study might operate in any community, especially one that is embarking on its first retraining program for large numbers of men with little education and only limited work experience.

Sampling difficulties and the need for further refinement of the attitude assessment techniques used here, discussed elsewhere in this report, further restrict the generalizations which can be drawn from this study. The data are, however, considered adequate to support the conclusion that information programs on retraining need to be tailored to the community. It proved to be especially difficult to enroll potential trainees who were isolated from normal channels of communications by lack of education and extreme poverty.

ANALYSIS OF FACTORS IN DECISIONS TO FOREGO RETRAINING

Background of the Study

This study is a byproduct of the first two retraining projects undertaken in Virginia under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. These were: (1) a 1-year program of training in brick masonry, automobile mechanics, sheet metal work, electronics technology, and building maintenance, offered by the Norfolk Division of Virginia State College at its campus; and (2) a 12-week training course in automobile servicing (work as a service station attendant with the ability to make minor repairs), offered by the Norfolk office of the Virginia Employment Commission at a leased site.

The programs were open to qualified men in the Norfolk-Portsmouth labor market area, which includes the cities of Norfolk, Portsmouth, Virginia Beach, and Chesapeake. At the time of the study, it had a population of approximately 700,000 and a work force of 165,000. This included 50,100 employees of naval and other Federal installations and approximately 16,000 employees of manufacturing establishments. Retail distribution and service industries accounted for the bulk of the remainder. Unemployment in the area has consistently been below the national level. It fluctuated between 3 and 4 percent during April-September 1963, when this study was conducted. Much of the unskilled employment is seasonal construction and resort work.

The directors of these training programs experienced great difficulty in filling their classes. Both carried out comprehensive "grass roots" programs of recruitment to interest potential enrollers in the opportunities for and the prospective benefits of training. Recruitment efforts included use of the usual mass media, talks to church congregations, and the distribution of fact sheets in barber shops, restaurants, bars, pool parlors, and other gathering places.

The Virginia Employment Commission identified and attempted to contact approximately 680 men who were eligible for enrollment in the training programs; that is, unemployed men who were between the ages of 21 and 65 and who were heads of households. Of these, 115 enrolled in training (100 in the College program and 15 in the Commission program) and another 15 or so applied but were not accepted because of lack of space in the courses for which their aptitudes and interests seemed fitted. The remaining 550 men were classified, for purposes of this study, as potential rejecters of training. Ten men who withdrew from the College program and three who withdrew from the Commission program were subsequently added to this group.

Concepts. Data were collected to test 10 hypotheses regarding possible deterrents to enrollment in the training programs. These hypotheses were based on the experiences and conjectures of officials of the Virginia Employment Commission and the directors and recruiters of the training programs concerning the apparent reluctance of some men to enroll. A study of the literature concerning the motivations of workers and their attitudes toward social welfare programs also helped to form the frame of reference for the hypotheses. They were as follows:

1. That communications with the men did not adequately convey the requirements for enrollment in the programs or the potential benefits.
2. That education and training, work experience, and family characteristics differed for enrollers and rejecters.
3. That the men who did not enroll in the program felt that the training allowances were too low.
4. That the men who did not enroll would have felt academically insecure in classroom work on a college campus.

5. That the idea of school attendance by older persons conflicted with cultural expectations for the men who did not enroll in the program.
6. That the men who did not enroll regarded the training program as some form of government relief which would have compromised their self-respect.
7. That the men who did not enroll had some reservations about the possibility of migration for placement.
8. That the men who did not enroll in the program felt that the economy would eventually reabsorb them.
9. That the men who did not enroll felt that they would experience difficulties in placement.
10. That the men who did not enroll in the program lacked self-reliance.

Methods. The data for testing these 10 hypotheses were obtained in interviews with both enrollers and rejecters of training. All of the 90 men who remained in the College program were interviewed. They are referred to hereafter as the Enrollers. Too few men enrolled in the Commission program to warrant inclusion of this group in the study.

An attempt at random selection of rejecters for interview was not as successful as hoped, because of difficulties in finding those selected. First, the investigators carefully followed an alternate number system of sampling. They exhausted their sampling pool. They then made a systematic effort to find all who could not be found during the controlled sampling. The number found constituted the final sample of 224.

For analysis, the sample has been divided into two groups who rejected the College training program--58 men who had completed 9 years of school or less, referred to as College Rejecters (1-9), and 116 men with more education referred to as College Rejecters (10-13), and a third group of 50 men who rejected the Commission training program, referred to as Commission Rejecters. The College rejecter groups had a heavy concentration of Negroes and the Commission Rejecters a heavy concentration of whites. The latter were much younger. The College Enrollers were all Negro.

Interviewing began in April 1963 and ended in September, 1963.[1] A team of interviewers from the faculty of the College and the staff of the Commission conducted the interviews.

The interviewers experienced great difficulty in making contact with the men in the sample of rejecters, especially those who lived in low income and low education neighborhoods. Many of the men did not have telephones, and many had moved since their last contact with the Employment Commission, leaving no forwarding address. Others were at home only occasionally or at irregular hours. The interviewers resorted to leaving word with neighbors and former neighbors that the prospective interviewee was being sought for a beneficial purpose (this qualification seemed quite important); contact was often established by this method. The interviewers often encountered distrust in the low income districts, and in the early stages of the study, rapport was not established quickly. As the interviewer became a familiar figure in the neighborhood, however, this distrust seemed to fade.

---

[1] Although this period included the seasonal peaks for construction and resort work, in which many of the unskilled workers in the area find jobs, it is unlikely that seasonal job opportunities affected the men's decisions about enrolling in training, since these had been made between November 1962 and January 1963.

When the interviews were conducted, both enrollers and rejecters were asked for information on their personal and family characteristics in order to test the second hypothesis--that such characteristics would differ for the two groups. They were also asked a variety of questions about how they had learned of the training programs in order to test the hypothesis regarding inadequate communications. Most of the data for testing the other eight hypotheses consist of the men's reactions to a series of paired statements expressing opposite points of view on the various attitudes which were assumed in the hypotheses.[2] To provide further insight into their attitudes, as well as a consistency check on certain points, those who rejected training were also asked to state their reasons for not enrolling, and to state what the government ought to do to assist the unemployed.

The remainder of this section is devoted to an analysis of these data, chiefly through comparisons of the data for the Enrollers with those for the two groups of College Rejecters. This analysis is supplemented occasionally by comments and observations obtained from the interviewers and from tape recordings of the interviews and conversations with the men and their families. The tables referred to are included in the Statistical Appendix to this report.

Adequacy of Communications

To collect information concerning the area of communications, the interviewers asked the men if they had received information about the program, when they had heard about it, and whether the information had been received from official sources or by word of mouth. Most important, they were interested in learning if the requirements for enrollment in the program were properly understood, and questioned the men concerning their understanding of the length of the program and their concepts of their eligibility when they received information about it.

---

[2] The method used is described in detail in the Statistical Appendix, pp. 35-36.

Most of the men reported that they had received information about the retraining programs. The Commission Rejecters had all heard about the programs and 90 percent of the College Rejecters (10-13) had received information about them. (See table 1.) Approximately 14 percent of the College Rejecters (1-9) had not heard about the program. Also, 32 percent of this group received information about the programs after the classes had been filled. Although only a small number of this group (8 percent) had attempted to enroll when they received this information, all would have had to be denied.

The men were also asked how they first received information about the programs. The majority of the Enrollers stated that they heard about them by a letter from the Employment Commission (24 percent) or through a conference with an Employment Commission Counselor (37 percent), although 17 percent heard about them by word of mouth and 10 percent read about the programs in the newspaper. (See table 2.) On the other hand, 40 percent of the College Rejecters (10-13) and 24 percent of the College Rejecters (1-9) heard about the programs by word of mouth. Significantly, few of the men heard the news in church or business establishments, which were two of the principal targets of the "grass roots" program of recruitment. Possibly, of course, the information was received by word of mouth from a person who first received it at church or in a business establishment. Radio and television also ranked low as sources of information.

The percent of the men who were not aware of the retraining programs seemed quite significant to the investigators in view of the extensive publicity given these programs during both the recruiting and the training periods. Local newspapers and radio and television stations presented daily feature stories on the retraining programs, and almost weekly, carried news of retraining on a national, state or local level. There was also the "grass roots" recruitment program described earlier. It may have been especially difficult for men not reporting regularly to the Employment Commission to receive word of the program. Many of those studies had exhausted their unemployment compensation. (Some who had found employment could be classified as underemployed because of their low wages and intermittent work.)

More of the enrollers than of the Rejecters felt that they were eligible for enrollment when they first received information about the program, and fewer were employed at the time.[3] (See table 3). These differences were not significant, but there were marked differences in the ways in which the Enrollers and the Rejecters explored the possibilities of enrolling (table 4). Far more of the Enrollers reported directly to the Virginia Employment Commission office.

Some 50-60 percent of the College Rejecter groups stated that they did not correctly understand the program's length when they first received the information, but nearly all correctly identified the duration in the interview (table 5). This initial misunderstanding may have been a significant factor in their decisions to forego training, however.

---

[3] Even though some of both groups were actually employed, all of the men had had at least one spell of unemployment during the period October 1962-January 1963, when trainees were being recruited for the programs and thus met eligibility requirements.

Characteristics of Enrollers and Rejecters

Data for enrollers and rejecters were compared for age, the highest grade completed in school, education and training in the military service, and the incidence of vocational or trade training in school. Size of family, number of workers in the family, and family income were also compared. Since vocational choices and aspirations often reflect contacts with close friends and relatives engaged in a particular type of occupation (trades, for example), the men were also asked about such associations.

Many differences were noted in the comparisons. The average age of the Enrollers and both College Rejecter groups was 36, but the Commission Rejecters' average age was only 28. (See table 6.) Race differences in the sample may have accounted for this difference. More Negro than white men in the upper age brackets may be unemployed in this labor market.

The average grade completed in school by both Enrollers and Rejecters was approximately 10th grade. (See table 7.) Two men in the latter group had finished only the first grade. Also, there were more persons with less than 10 years of education in this group and fewer high school graduates. The average level of education, however, was similar to those for the State and the Nation.[4]

The level of education of the Negro rejecters and enrollers in the sample seemed high (a median of 10-11 years of school). The median years of school completed by adult Negro men in Virginia was 6.5 in 1960 and for the labor market area studied, 7.4.[5] For young Negro men, however, the level was much higher; the 14-24 age group in this labor market area averaged 9.7 years of school completed. Many of the men in this study were comparatively young.

---

[4] Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1963, Washington, D. C., Bureau of the Census, p. 121.

[5] U.S. Census of Population: 1960. Detailed Characteristics, Virginia Final Report PC (1)-48D, Washington, D. C., U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1962, pp. 346,350.

About four-fifths of both categories of College Rejecters were married, as were the Enrollers, but only about two-fifths of the Commission Rejecters were married. (See table 8.) In most cases, at least one person in the household worked. (See table 9.) The spouse was the usual additional member of the household who worked, although many of the College Rejecters (10-13) and the Commission Rejecters reported that a parent was a working member of the household. Significantly, perhaps, the Enrollers and the College Rejecters (1-9) had fewer full-time workers in the household and their earnings when all working members of the household had employment were less. These earnings averaged $50.83 and $51.29 per week respectively, compared with $58.96 for College Rejecters (10-13) and $82.90 per week for Commission Rejecters (table 10). With the exception of the College Rejecters (1-9), the Enrollers also had the most dependents per household (average 4.5 and 3.9 respectively). (See table 11.)

These findings were contrary to the investigators' prior reasoning that persons with large families and limited financial assistance from others in the household would be less likely to enroll. This did not appear to be the case, with perhaps the exception of the rather large families of the College Rejecter (1-9) group. The other rejecters, with fewer dependents and higher incomes than the Enrollers, might well have been reluctant to relinquish their slightly higher buying power, even though it took more household manpower to gain this income.

Most of the men were renting their homes, and about 1 in 7 had moved since the inception of the project (table 12). One of the Commission group lived in a trailer.

In economic status, it appeared that the Commission group and the College Rejecters (10-13) were similar. Both had higher family income and fewer dependents. This, perhaps, reflects the comparatively high education of the College group and the high proportion of whites in the Commission group.

If economic status was indeed a factor in deterring the men from enrolling in retraining, it might well have affected the men with little education, low incomes, and few people in the household to help them financially as well as men with more education and higher incomes which they were reluctant to curtail in order to pursue training. This reasoning might be given added credence when it is considered that almost all of the interviewees pointed out that the training allowances for the program were too low.

One of the more striking differences between the groups in work experience was found in the extent of service in the Armed Forces and general education equivalency and vocational training while in service. Far more of the Enrollers had these experiences. About three-fifths had had military service, compared with slightly more than one-third of the College Rejecters and one-half of the Commission Rejecters. (See table 13.) One in three had received general education equivalency training in the military, compared with approximately one in ten of the Commission and College Rejecter (10-13) groups and one in twenty of the College Rejecters (1-9). Some 33 percent of the Enrollers had also received vocational training while in the military, compared with 16 and 14 percent respectively for the College Rejecters (1-9) and the Commission men and 22 percent for the College Rejecters (10-13).

Also important, perhaps, was that many more of the Enrollers had worked outside of their home communities (table 14). Cosmopolitanism in employment experience is regarded as contributory to attitudes favoring flexible work habits. It probably also has a bearing on attitudes toward training.

This experience, together with familiarity with continuing education and the familiarity with other communities, as shown in the following tabulation, might well have induced more of the Enrollers to recognize an opportunity for advancement through retraining and to attempt to take advantage of it.

	Enrollers	College Rejecters (1-9)	College Rejecters (10-13)	Commission Rejecters
Total Number Studied	90	50	104	50
Percent who reported				
Military service	61	38*	38*	50
General education Equivalency training	36	6*	9*	10*
Training in a trade	33	16*	22	14*
Work outside Tidewater Virginia	67	24*	39*	30*

*Figure differs significantly from the comparable figure for Enrollers, using Chi square test of significance at the .01 level; that is, a difference of this magnitude would occur by chance only about 1 time out of 100.

There were also some differences in the number of individuals who had received trade training in public schools, as shown in Table 15. The Enrollers had far more men with this experience than the Commission Rejecters, perhaps because of the relatively small number of white students enrolled in vocational courses in area schools. Few of the college Rejecters (1-9) had entered high school, where these courses are usually offered.

In addition, fewer of the College Rejecters (1-9) had worked at a trade or with tradesmen and fewer had a close friend or relative who worked at a trade (table 16). This propinquity to a given vocation is deemed important in vocational choice by authorities. Although this factor might not be deemed decisive, it might well have a cumulative effect with the other backgrounds of experience, i.e., military and vocational education and vocational experiences outside the home community.

The men were asked to indicate their areas of interest among the trades offered in the retraining programs if they had enrolled in retraining programs. These trades, as mentioned earlier, were sheet metal work, automobile mechanics, masonry, electronics, building maintenance, and automobile servicing. Only a small percent of the College Rejecters stated that they would have been interested in none of these areas (table 17). Maintenance and sheet metal work were lowest in preference.

Most of the College Rejecters stated that they would have enrolled if the college training program had been shorter. This was a 52-week program, compared with 12 weeks for the Commission program. The extended period of training seemed to give pause to many. When asked for a preference, three-fourths gave 6 or 9 months as an optimal training period (table 18).

Reasons Given by the Men for Not Enrolling

This desire for a shorter training program is reflected in the reason most often given by the men for not enrolling: that the $25 a week training allowance was inadequate to support their families for the duration of the training. Two-thirds of the College Rejecters and three-fourths of the Commission group gave this reason, as shown in the tabulation on the following page.

Stated reason for not enrolling	Percent giving stated reason[1]		
	College Rejecters (1-9)	College Rejecters (10-13)	Commission Rejecters
Training allowance too small to support family for duration of training	66	63	74
Found employment	10	16	16
Felt academically inadequate	10	7	--
Felt ineligible	18	10	--
Misunderstood information or received incorrect information	28	12	12
Applied too late	20	16	16
Had no interest in courses offered	--	--	36
Having financial or personal-family difficulties at inception of program	10	10	10
Other	20	23	16

[1] Some men gave two or more reasons; consequently the sums of percents exceed 100.

The importance assigned to the reasons here was based on responses to the question, "What were the main reasons you did not enroll in the training program?" Therefore, some of the figures differ from those shown elsewhere in the report, which are based on differently phrased questions.

Second in importance were misunderstood information (for College Rejecters 1-9), finding employment (for College Rejecters 10-13), and lack of interest in the training offered (for the Commission group). While none of these categories included a majority of the men interviewed, it seemed significant to the investigators that about a third of the Commission group had no interest in the program which they were offered.

Amount of Training Allowance

Besides being the leading reason given by the men for not enrolling, the men's concern about the low training allowance was also apparent in their answers to questions used to gauge their attitudes about retraining and unemployment.[6] To test the hypothesis that the men who did not enroll in the program felt that the training allowances were too low, the interviewees were read, at different times in the interview, two statements which were believed to embody opposite points of view on this matter:

> The training allowance of $25 per week for the new program is too little assistance for a family in this area.
>
> The government allowance of $25 per week for the retraining program is enough to help a man who really wants to go to school.

The men were asked whether their opinion on each statement was "agree," "can't say," or "disagree." These responses had respective weights of 3, 2, 1 on the first, or positive statement of the attitude, and of 1, 2, 3 on the second.

The average sum of ratings given this set of statements by the Commission and College Rejecter (1-9) groups was 5, indicating substantial support of the hypothesis that low training allowances were a deterrent. (See table 19.) A high average rating (5.1) was also given this area by the Enrollers, perhaps reflecting their experience during several months of training. But the College Rejecters (10-13) had a 3.0 rating, which indicated disagreement and a lack of support of the hypothesis.

---

[6] The attitude data were gathered by use of an opinionnaire or attitude scale. The scale used the Likert method of assigning reverse weights to ratings for positive and negative statements which reflect polar points of view on the matter involved. (See Allen Edwards, Techniques of Attitudes Scale Construction, New York, Appleton-Century-Crafts, Inc., 1957, ch. IV.)

The method is described in greater detail in the Statistical Appendix (p. 35-36).

The divergence of this group seems odd. No ready explanation can be given. It might be remembered, however, that their level of living was higher and that more persons in the households worked. They may have felt more secure in their ability to support their families on this allowance plus other income. About half indicated that they felt that the allowance was sufficient to help a man who really wanted to go to school, and approximately 40 percent in the other groups agreed with the former and 90 percent agreed with the latter. Only one-fifth of the College Rejecters (10-13) compiled perfect ratings of agreement with the suggestion that the allowances were too low, while about half of the other groups compiled perfect agreement ratings. It will be recalled that the length of program also seemed to be a factor in the men's assessment of the adequacy of the training allowance. The ban on outside earnings probably also entered into it. In fact, this restriction was the determining factor for several enrollers who withdrew from the College program.

Possibly the preliminary results on these points, which were made available to the Congress during its consideration of the 1963 amendments to the MDTA,[6a] made some contribution to the correction of the conditions that are noted as the main deterrents to enrollment in this final report. The amendments authorized higher training allowances and removed restrictions on outside earnings during the training period. Replications of the study under these new conditions might produce results quite different from those set forth here.

[6a] See Hearings Before the Select Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 88th Congress, 1st Session, on HR 6991, HR 7000, and HR 7377, pp. 87-110, for the testimony of Lyman B. Brooks, James A. Bowser, William F. Brazziel, and William M. Cooper on the 1963 amendments.

Location of Project

The staff of the college training program hypothesized that the location of the program on a college campus might have been a deterrent to enrollment. As mentioned earlier, the directors of both programs--the Commission project as well as that of the College--experienced great difficulty in filling their classes. The staff hypothesized that potential enrollers felt that they might not fit into the campus life of the college or that the college could not train them for work in the skilled trades. The reaction items in this case were:

> Going to school on a college campus is out of line for the ordinary person.
>
> Men in this community can learn technical skills at a college as well as any place else.

The rejecters' responses to these two items did not support the hypothesis. Over 90 percent of all rejecter groups agreed with the second item, which suggested that the location of the project did not in fact deter enrollment. However, the enrollers, perhaps reflecting their experience during the first few months of training, exhibited rather substantial agreement with the hypothesis. Indeed, 30 percent compiled a 6.0 score of perfect agreement with the proposition that the men had reservations about technical training at a college.

Academic Inadequacy

It was conjectured by those involved that the rejecters of the program had feelings of academic inadequacy and that this was a factor in their hesitancy to enroll in the training programs. It was felt that the older men would have doubts about their ability to succeed in a classroom situation. The reaction items for this hypothesis were:

> Older men don't have too much trouble learning new things.
>
> Older men are not able to keep up in school with young people.

The average sums of ratings for this area were positive (4 plus) for all the categories of Rejecters, as well as for the Enrollers. The Enrollers might well have felt that they would have difficulty but were willing to try anyway. Those who were veterans were less apprehensive than those who were not.

School and Cultural Expectations

There is a growing literature on the role of the culture in determining the individual's concepts of participation in learning activities. Generally, it is felt that low income families do not value education as highly as middle income families, that they expect their children to begin work earlier in life, and that they do not expect adults to continue their education. The investigators were interested in the latter concepts as a factor in this study. The reaction items for the test of the hypothesis were:

> People in the church and community approve of older persons going back to school.
>
> People would feel funny going back to school after being out for a number of years.

The average sums of ratings on these items were low for all categories of the men and did not support the hypothesis (table 22). The Commission group, which compiled the lowest rating, had a much lower percentage who felt that people in the church and community approved of older persons going back to school, but at the same time a much lower percentage who felt that people would feel funny returning to school and a much higher percent of "can't say" answers.

Retraining as a Form of Welfare

One of the problems of directors of social service agencies is the misconceptions held by many persons of the nature of their programs and services. Many people often consider them a form of welfare and reject them on the basis that acceptance would compromise their position of respect and dignity in their community. The investigators tested this concept as a factor. The results did not support it. The reaction items were:

> The government program to retrain people
> is just the same as relief.
>
> The government should help a man learn a new
> trade so that he can get a job.

The sums of ratings here were the lowest of all the pairs of items in the study. All were 2 plus, indicating substantial disagreement with the idea. (See table 23) Only the College Rejecter (1-9) group indicated substantial ambivalence; 34 percent of these men agreed that the program was a form of relief, but 94 percent thought that the government should help them learn new skills. This could reflect confusion about the nature of relief or the training programs or both.

Reluctance to Migrate for Placement

Many individuals are reluctant to leave their home communities in search of employment. This seems true in many cases in the pockets of dire poverty about which we read so much today.

Areas which are isolated by geography or which have an unusual closeness of community and an unusual identification by persons with the community seem to engender this reluctance.[7] The metropolitan area where this study was carried out seems to fit this description to some degree, being on a kind of peninsula, bounded on three sides by a river, a bay, and an ocean, and the residents refer to it as "Tidewater Virginia," seeming unusually proud of both its past and its present. The investigators determined, therefore, to test for the presence of reluctance tc migrate to find work, although migration was not a requisite for enrollment in the training programs, and the men were aware that it was not. The reaction items were

> People don't mind moving from Tidewater to get work.
>
> People don't want to leave Tidewater to get work.

The average sums of ratings of the reactions of the men seemed to support the hypothesis that some reluctance to move from the area to find employment exists. The Commission group was an exception, however. The sums of ratings averaged almost 5.0 in the Enroller and the College Rejecter groups but only 3.6 in the Commission group (table 24). Age might be a factor here, as it is recalled that this group was approximately 8 years younger than the other three. Only 12 percent of this group scored 6.0 on this item, compared with approximately 45 percent of the other groups.

The Economy will Reabsorb the Unemployed

There was a question in the minds of the investigators concerning the extent to which the unemployed in this area grasped the significance of national trends in unemployment. Although the newspapers, radio and television contained some discussions on the problems of hard core unemployment and the rather dim prospects of unskilled men with little education finding full-time jobs, the investigators wondered if the men in this study felt that unemployment represented a temporary economic recession, a recovery from which would mean full employment for all. The reaction items to test this hypothesis were:

---

[7] Ely Chinoy, American Workers and Their Dreams, New York, Doubleday, 1955.

> Employment will pick up after awhile and all the people will have work.
>
> Men will not be able to get work because machines are more and more putting them out of work.

The average sums of ratings for most of the men did not seem to support the hypothesis that the men felt that the economy would reabsorb them. (See table 25.) Somewhat more of the Commission Rejecters, most of whom were white, than of the three predominately Negro groups, felt this way. There was substantial ambivalence among the College Rejecters (1-9): More than half stated that they believed that things would pick up after awhile and all the people will have work, but at the same time, three-fourths of them believed that increasing mechanization represented a threat. This paradoxical attitude may reflect the unemployment situation in the area, where the unemployment rate has been low but unemployment among workers with little education has been severe.

Placement Difficulties After Training

A question which was encountered often in the recruitment phase of the training program concerned placement after retraining. Prospective trainees often asked if there were a demand for the occupations which were being offered for training. Although the question was not prevalent among prospective trainees, many observers inquired about the operation of discriminatory practices on the part of employers and unions where the employment of Negro craftsmen were concerned. The investigators attempted to test these questions as hypotheses. There were three pairs of reaction items here:

> Even if a man has a trade, it is hard to get work.
>
> If a man had a new trade, he would then be able to get work.
>
> No matter what trade a Negro learns, industries around here will not take him on.
>
> If Negroes can only get good skilled training, they can get good jobs in this area.
>
> No matter how good a craftsman a Negro becomes, the unions will keep him out of a job in this area.
>
> Unions in this area are fairly reasonable where Negro craftsmen are concerned.

None of the hypotheses concerning reservations about placement was supported by the average sums of ratings. None of the averages was above the midpoint of 4.0. (See table 26.)

Lack of Self-Reliance

Many persons feel strongly that the unemployed are not self-reliant. They feel that these people regard the government as a major source of support and that they are content to live as a government ward. This reasoning also holds that if unemployed persons would get out and try harder to find work, unemployment would decrease substantially. The investigators attempted to ascertain whether the men were self-reliant with respect to finding a job. The reaction items were:

> If unemployed persons would get out and try harder to find work, unemployment would be cured.
>
> The government should take full responsibility for supporting people who are out of work.

The average sums of ratings did not support the hypothesis that the men in this sample lacked self-reliance, as defined by these items. This is, however, a difficult attitude to measure, and undoubtedly merits further and more concentrated study.

About one-fourth of the men stated that they believed that unemployment would be cured if people would get out and try harder to find work, and one-third believed that the government should take full responsibility for supporting people who are out of work. At least two-fifths of the men in all groups took a neutral position on this item and preferred alternatives as solutions. These alternatives followed closely the listing by the men of the best methods for helping unemployed men. This listing is treated below.

Opinions Regarding Help to the Unemployed

One of the key questions asked was what methods the men recommended for helping the unemployed. This question was placed near the middle of the interview, so as to assure a rather full discussion. The replies revealed five major categories of opinions concerning possible solutions to unemployment, as shown in table 28.

Retraining programs sponsored by government were stated most frequently by all of the men involved as a method of solving unemployment. Approximately two-thirds of the Commission and College Rejecters (10-13) stated this as a method, but only half of the College Rejecters (1-9) did so. The initiation of public works programs was the method which received the next highest rating. Approximately one-fourth of both College groups and one-eighth of the Commission group stated this as a method.

The men were also concerned with methods of learning about and securing jobs in the community. This was mentioned frequently by the College groups. This method was not anticipated by the investigators, and the interviewers were directed to question the men closely about this factor. Many of the men seemed to feel that good jobs existed in the city but because of a lack of knowledge about them, they were not able to make application. Many also felt that their abilities were higher than the jobs to which they were referred by the local Employment Commission and private employment agencies. A sizable group of the College Rejecters (almost 20 percent) felt that there should be more communications between employed and unemployed men regarding job openings. This might seem odd until it is recalled that a word of mouth communication system seems effective in this culture.

A few men in each group felt that industry should take on more unemployed persons and train them on the job. Some of the men recalled that during World War II, industries in the area taught new skills when manpower needs became acute. Remembering the high employment at that time, perhaps, one man suggested that another war would solve unemployment.

Some men thought that vocational training in high school should be improved, and several thought that children should begin vocational training in the elementary grades. Others said that everyone should at least get a high school education.

A small group would also limit or regulate automation. The investigators were surprised that this group was not larger.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

To sum up, a rejecter of retraining programs, as portrayed in this study, closely resembles an enroller. Like the enroller, the typical rejecter was about 35 years old, married, and had three or four dependents including his wife. He had completed the 10th or 11th grade. One member of his household worked, usually his wife, and their combined earnings, when both were employed, totaled about $50 per week--somewhat more if he had more education, or if he was white.

Unlike the enroller, however, the rejecter had seldom been in military service or worked outside his home community. He was also less likely than the enroller to have worked with or near skilled tradesmen.

The rejecter seemed prone to misunderstand information about the new training programs. He also seemed to think that he could not afford a long period of training with the low training allowance and the strictures on after-school employment involved in these programs. In fact, these seemed to be the three major influences in the decisions of a majority of the men to forego retraining:

1. The training allowance of $25 per week. The men considered it inadequate to support their families over the period of the training programs. Approximately two-thirds of the men who did not enroll indicated that this was a factor in their decisions to forego retraining. The regulations discouraging after-school employment during the training period seemed to reinforce this reservation.

2. The length of the training program. The men were concerned that they would not be able to support their families over a long period of time. Approximately four-fifths of the men who rejected training programs of 52 weeks stated that they would have enrolled if the programs had been shorter.

3. Communications with prospective trainees. Communications problems impeded the recruitment of trainees and resulted in some misunderstandings concerning the nature of the training programs. The fact that the programs were the first to be initiated in the area seemed to exacerbate this situation. Approximately one-sixth of the rejecters reported that they did not feel eligible for the program when they first received information about it. About one-fourth of the rejecters received information about the program by wo word of mouth.

   About half stated specifically that the length of the programs was not clear when they first received information. More than one-fifth received information too late to enroll even if they had attempted to do so.

Backgrounds of experience in the military service, association with skilled workers, and work experience outside the home community--all deemed important in occupational choice and adaptability--also seemed to predispose the men to enrollment. More than three-fifths of the enrollers had served in the military service, compared with about two-fifths of the rejecters, and 36 and 8 percent, respectively, had received general education equivalency training in the service. Nearly two-thirds of the enrollers had worked with skilled tradesmen, and two-thirds had worked outside their home communities, compared with approximately two-fifths and one-third, respectively, of the rejecters.

Nevertheless, the rejecters' opinions of how best to solve unemployment in their community were led by more government retraining programs. Other possible solutions stated by the men were the initiation of public works programs, improved job placement services, and more on-the-job training by industry.

Thus, the men reacted negatively to items in the interview designed to ascertain the lack of self-reliance or a "welfare mentality." Most seemed eager to find employment and many were interested in retraining. The men did not seem to regard the training program as a form of relief. Despite the limitations of the measure used to gauge self-reliance, the investigators regard this finding as worthy of further study. Psychologists generally believe that long exposure to poverty and bigotry creates a "welfare mentality" among minority groups. That it had not done so in this case suggests additional factual tests of this belief.

There seemed to be some reservations on the part of the men toward leaving the community, which has certain provincial aspects, to find work. Most men--the rejecters as well as the enrollers--felt that with new skills, they would have little difficulty in finding employment in the area.

School attendance at an advanced age seemed to pose a problem for the men who did not enroll, but the same obtained for those who did enroll. Among the enrollers, the veterans were less apprehensive than the nonveterans.

In sum, the investigators felt that the findings supported two of the ten hypotheses tested and partially supported a third. It seems clear that communications were inadequate and the training allowance too low. And it also appears that limited work experience deterred some of the men from enrolling.

These deterrents to enrollment do not seem unique. Under similar circumstances, they might well operate in any community. This would seem especially true if retraining programs were being initiated in the community for the first time and if a large number of undereducated persons were involved.

None of the factors identified as deterrents in the study seemed unusually difficult. The investigators believe that most could be overcome.

The financial situations of the potential trainees, the length of the training programs, communications with the men, community attitudes toward unemployment, worker concepts of retraining, and alternatives in course offerings all seemed to be important in this situation and will probably have to be considered in similar situations.

Recommendations

Directors of new retraining programs in a community might well initiate long range information programs designed to facilitate community understanding of retraining programs, but should be prepared for only gradual acceptance of the benefits and responsibilities of retraining on the part of those involved.

This type of program must utilize a wide variety of techniques. One of the best might be a centrally located demonstration retraining project whose trainees and graduates would be living testimony to the effectiveness of retraining as a solution to unemployment. This seems especially important where potential trainees have limited education. Agricultural Extension agents use this technique in trying to achieve the adoption of new planting, fertilizing, and cultivation techniques. Their experiments in techniques to facilitate the adoption of hybrid seed corn, for example, are often regarded as classics. In the area where this study was conducted, while great difficulty was experienced in filling the first classes, succeeding classes have been easier to fill. There are now many inquiries about retraining and many requests to be put on the "waiting list" for new classes. Retraining had been in existence in the area for 14 months when these indications of awareness and acceptance became apparent. It seems that this awareness can be quite parochial, however. Many of the community leaders meeting in the State capital, also in the 14th month of retraining, were not well informed about retraining programs, but all were vitally interested in learning more about them.

The community advisory committee technique might also be utilized. A city or a county might contain advisory committees for several specific parts of the greater community. The first group recruited will probably consist of the "innovators" in the community--the cosmopolites and the better educated.

Also, the directors of programs might experiment with new types of recruiting techniques. A 3- or 4-day workshop with instruction by social psychologists would seem valuable. Exchanges of ideas and formulation of new plans might be the result. Regional and area supervisors might also benefit from this experience.

Regardless of the efficacy of the information program, many persons with large families and small family incomes will probably have to forego retraining unless methods can be found to help them feed, clothe, and house their families during the retraining period. The 1963 Amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act permit after-school employment during retraining and more liberal training allowances. These provisions might be of great benefit to low income families. The staff of one of the retraining programs in this study, for example, attempted to secure surplus food for the men who were experiencing severe financial problems. The men were completely convinced of the value of this approach but local welfare officials were only able to give assistance in the form of free school lunches for the children. Communities which are vitally concerned with growing economic dependency might well make the small extra investment in welfare benefits which will put these families on their feet and enable them to break out of the poverty cycle. A full program of assistance might include surplus food and clothing, stamps and medical assistance for adults and children--items which seem to pose large problems for families with small savings and low incomes.

Planners who regard poverty-ridden individuals as lacking self-reliance and respect for the value of education might well examine the factual support for this belief. The findings of this study which indicate a good deal of self-reliance and considerable support for education are similar to the findings of Riessman,[8] Sears, Maccoby and Levin,[9] Hyman,[10] and a growing number of other investigators. Education is desired by disadvantaged persons more than is generally realized, but as this study found, they often feel inhibited about stepping out of the routine in which they find themselves to secure it. Also, it has been found that these people are often very pragmatic in their desire for learning and that they feel threatened and frustrated by the procedures for enrollment.[11]

Government retraining programs which actively recruit persons might transcend these barriers to learning. Also, the broadened provisions for literacy training in the 1963 MDTA amendments might well serve as the greatly needed catalyst in the solution of the national problem of adult literacy. While attempts at upgrading literacy levels have too often suffered from some reservations on the part of the adults toward participation and while attempts at upgrading the technical skills of adults have suffered from the lack of adult literacy, in conjuncture, they should be an effective approach.

---

[8] Frank Riessman, Workers' Attitudes Toward Participation and Leadership, unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1955.

[9] Robert Sears, Eleanor Maccoby, and Harry Levin, Patterns of Child Rearing, Evanston, Row, Peterson and Co., 1957.

[10] Herbert Hyman, "The Value Systems of Different Classes," in Class, Status, and Power, edited by Reinhard Bendix and Seymour M. Lipset, Glencoe, Ill., The Free Press Co., 1953.

[11] Frank Riessman, op. cit.

It might well be that the most difficult problem will be to reach and bring large numbers of this undereducated group into the retraining programs. This will probably be true at least for the first undereducated trainees to be recruited in a community. Recruiters will probably have to lean heavily on both the information system and the advisory committee described above when dealing with a man in this group. A more personalized approach will have to be made to some men in this group. These men are the most isolated in the community, cut off even from the informal channels of communication. The concept of technical training is apt to be foreign to these men and their ability to comprehend instructions and explanations might be inadequate. Also, they may have more family responsibility and less family financial assistance. These types of persons receive their information by word of mouth and most importantly, perhaps, they make their decisions on advice from persons they trust. Ministers, union leaders, foremen, employers, sheriffs, morticians, physicians, church lay leaders, school teachers, bankers, merchants and close friends who are literate are all examples of persons who are requested to offer advice to these persons. All could be pressed into service to interpret retraining programs and to offer suggestions and advice concerning enrollment.

After the initial classes have begun, techniques such as open house days, tell-a-story slides and tape recordings of the instruction plus newletters written in simple language might be utilized to call attention to and interpret the on-going demonstration of retraining. The trainees themselves might be interviewed on the radio stations to which these people listen. Their wives and children might be organized into auxiliary groups. Many of these techniques were utilized in the retraining programs in this study. Reaching these people, informing them and changing their attitudes sometimes will be difficult, but it will not be impossible.

The foregoing suggestions follow closely the general set of rules or principles observed by social psychologists in their attempts to change attitudes. Directors of retraining might follow them also. A partial list is as follows:

1. Attitudes, once learned, are difficult to modify but not impossible.
2. New attitudes are learned through the experiences of association, transfer and need satisfaction.
3. New attitudes are more likely to be transferred through face-to-face contacts and group discussion than through impersonal lectures or mass media.
4. If a person realizes that it is to his advantage to change, the process will be facilitated.
5. Changes take place if arrangements are made for persons to learn new ways of feeling and reacting through association.[12]

Finally, certain aspects of this study imply a need for replications of this type of research elsewhere. Levels of education, for example, vary greatly from region to region in this country. They also vary within a region. Research of this type might yield valuable information if carried out in cities where there are many census tracts with low median levels of education and in cities where there are few. In 1960, for example, Washington, D. C., had a median of 11.7 years of school completed for the total population, with only 3 of 93 census tracts having medians below grade 8. Birmingham, on the other hand, had a median level of 10.1 for its total population, but 27 of 44 tracts were beneath the eighth grade.[13] Attitudes and concepts concerning retraining in these two cities might also be different.

---

[12] William W. Lambert and Wallace E. Lambert, Social Psychology, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., Prentice-Hall, 1964, p. 65.

[13] Income and Education in Neighborhoods, Washington, D. C. and Birmingham, Ala., Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1963.

Research of this type might yeild valuable information if carried out in areas where unemployment is higher than was the case in this study. The findings of this study concerning attitudes toward reabsorption of unemployed men, migration for placement, and other matters might be different in such a setting.

A rural sample might be studied as well as a larger sample of youth and young adults similar to the Commission group in this study. Minority group attitudes toward unions might also be stronger and affect decisions more decisively than in this study in areas where unions are stronger and union discrimination has not been eliminated.

The time and modest expense involved in replication of studies of this type might well be justified. This is a diverse country and attempts to generalize too broadly from findings in one metropolitan area might cause planners to misjudge in attempting to aid certain groups which might be at the extremes of demographic characteristics.

The need for further study excepted, however, there seem to be few factors influencing decisions of unemployed, unskilled men to enroll in retraining programs which skillful planning and execution by the directors of these programs cannot overcome.

Explanatory Notes

This section presents the interview data from the study, in tabular form. In each table, the data are grouped by the four sample categories:

Enrollers--men who enrolled in the College retraining program.

College Rejecters (1-9)--men with less than 10 years of education who rejected retraining in the program conducted by the Norfolk Division of Virginia State College on its campus.

College Rejecters (10-13)--men with 10 but less than 14 years of education who rejected retraining in the College program.

Commission Rejecters--men who rejected retraining in a program sponsored by the Virginia Employment Commission.

Within these categories, data are shown by veteran status for some items.

Tables 19-27 present data for the sums of ratings used in the attitude assessment part of the study. These sums of ratings were computed in the following manner: For each attitude to be assessed, the interviewer asked his subject to express his opinion on two statements framed to express polar attitudes on the particular matter, by answering "agree," "can't say," or "disagree." Respective weights of 3, 2, and 1 were given to these responses to the positive statement of the attitude. The weighting was reversed for the negative statement.[1] Thus, to assess whether the men did not enroll in retraining because they feared they would have to leave the area in order to find work in their field of training, the responses to the two statements were weighted as follows:

---

[1] This method of assessing attitudes was developed by Rensis Likert, and is described fully by Allen Edwards in Techniques of Attitudes Scale Construction (New York, Appleton-Century-Crafts, Inc., 1957), ch. IV.

Item No. 1*	Statement	Weight assigned to response of-		
		Agree	Can't say	Disagree
10a	People don't mind moving from Tidewater to get work	1	2	3
3b	People don't want to leave Tidewater to get work	3	2	1

*The item number refers to position of the statements in the interview instrument; the statements on a given attitude were not placed in successive order.

The weights for each man's response to the two statements were then summed. A sum of 6 indicates complete agreement with the attitude, and a sum of 2, complete disagreement. A sum of 4 might indicate neutrality, or "can't say" feelings, but it, like sums of 3 or 5, might also reflect inconsistent or ambivalent responses or the failure of the two statements to express polar attitudes. Thus, in the foregoing example, a man who was reluctant to migrate in order to find work would disagree with item 10a and agree with item 3b, and the sum of his ratings would be 6.

Besides frequency data, the tables show measures of central tendency and variability where responses have been distributed over a range or a scale. They also show whether the means for the several Rejecter groups differ significantly from that for the Enrollers, using the Chi square or the t test of significance at the .01 level, as appropriate. That is, the observed difference was considered to be statistically significant if the odds were 99 to 1 against the chance occurrence of a difference of that magnitude.

Unless otherwise stated, the percents are based on the number of men in the sample who had received information about the training programs, as shown in table 1; that is, 90 Enrollers, 50 College Rejecters (1-9), 104 College Rejecters (10-13), and 50 Commission Rejecters.

List of Tables

Number Title Page

1 Receipt of Information About the Training Programs. . . 39
= 2 Method of Receiving Information About the Training Programs 39
3 Employment Status and Concepts of Eligibility for Enrollment Upon Receipt of Information Concerning the Retraining Programs 40
4 Inquiry About Possibility of Enrollment: Extent and Methods. 40
5 Understanding of Length of the Training Programs 41
6 Age Distribution. 41
7 Educational Attainment. 42
8 Marital Status. 42
9 Working Members in Households, and Their Relationship to Head 43
10 Total Weekly Earnings of Employed Household Members.. . . 44
11 Number of Dependents per Household. 44
12 Housing Situation 45
13 Military Service and Training 45
14 Work Experience Outside Tidewater Area. 45
15 Training in a Trade in Public School. 45
16 Trade Experience 46
17 Training Choices of Rejecters if Enrolled in Retraining Program 46
18 Desired Length of Training Program. 46
19 Attitude Ratings: That Training Allowance Was Too Low. . 47
20 Attitude Ratings: That Location of Training Project on College Campus Deterred Enrollment 47
21 Attitude Ratings: That Feelings of Academic Inadequacy Deterred Enrollment. 48
22 Attitude Ratings: That School Attendance by Older People Violates Cultural Expectations 49
23 Attitude Ratings: That Retraining Program Was a Form of Relief 50
24 Attitude Ratings: Reluctance to Migrate for Placement if Necessary. 50
25 Attitude Ratings: That Economy Will Reabsorb the Unemployed. 51
26 Attitude Ratings: Fear of Placement Difficulties After Training 52
27 Attitude Ratings: That the Unemployed Lack Self-Reliance 53
Percent of Respondents Agreeing with Positive and Nega-

Table 1. Receipt of Information About the Training Programs

Group 1/	Number in Group	Had received information: Percent of Total	Had received information: Number	Percent of those who had received information before deadline for application
Enrollers	90	100	90	100
College Rejecters (1-9)	58	86*	50	60
College Rejecters (10-13)	116	90	104	68*
Commission Rejecters	50	100	50	100

1/ For definition of groups, see first page of statistical appendix.

*Figure differs significantly from the comparable figure for Enrollers, using Chi square test of significance at the .01 level; that is, a difference of this magnitude would occur by chance only 1 time out of 100.

Table 2. Method of Receiving Information About the Training Programs (Percent distribution)

Method	Enrollers	College Rejecters (1-9)	College Rejecters (10-13)	Commission Rejecters
All Methods.	100	100	100	100
Explanation from Virginia Employment Commission Counselor.	37	40	19	44
Letter from Virginia Employment Commission.	24	6	12	52
Word of Mouth.	17	24	40	—
Newspapers.	10	8	15	4
Radio Newscast.	1	6	1	—
Radio Announcement	—	6	1	—
Television Announcement	2	2	—	—
Announcement in Church . .	2	2	—	—
Television Newscast. . . .	—	2	—	—
Announcement in Business Establishment.	1	—	—	—
Other Methods.	6	4	12	—

Table 3. Employment Status and Concepts of Eligibility for Enrollment Upon Receipt of Information Concerning the Retraining Programs (Percent of Respective Groups)

Group	Employed when information received		Felt they were eligible
	Total	Working full-time	
Enrollers	33	13	97
College Rejectors (1-9)	50	35	80
College Rejectors (10-13)	48	34	85
Commission Rejectors.	34	32	90

Table 4. Inquiry About Possibility of Enrollment: Extent and Methods

	Enrollers	College Rejecters (1-9)	College Rejecters (10-13)	Commission Rejecters
Inquired about the possibilities of enrolling in the training programs: Percent of group	100	64*	81	90
Number	90	32	84	45
	Percent Distribution of those who inquired			
All methods of inquiry	100	100	100	100
Reported to Virginia Employment Commission	81	60	58	52
Reported to College	7	20	23	—
Called Virginia Employment Commission	8	2	5	48
Talked to an acquaintance who had done one of the above	—	6	4	—
Called the College	2	6	5	—
Other	2	6	5	—

*Significantly different from figure for Enrollers; see footnote, table 1.

Table 5. Understanding of Length of the Training Programs
(Percent of respective groups)

Group	Stated that they correctly understood the length of training program on receipt of information	Correctly identified length of training program during interview
Enrollers	83	100
College Rejecters (1-9)	40*	90
College Rejecters (10-13)	48*	90
Commission Rejecters	90	Question not asked

Table 6. Age Distribution
(Number of respondents)

Age Group	Enrollers	College Rejecters (1-9)	College Rejecters (10-13)	Commission Rejecters
All ages	90	50	104	50
21 to 29 years.	5	3	7	40
30 to 39 years.	62	36	76	6
40 to 49 years.	13	7	9	1
50 to 65 years.	10	4	12	3
Median age.	37.7	33.6	34.8	28.4
Mean age.	36.0	36.3	36.1	28.0

*Significantly different from figure for Enrollers; see footnote, table 1.

Table 7. Educational Attainment
(Percent distribution)

Highest grade completed	Enrollers	College Rejecters (1-9)	College Rejecters (10-13)	Commission Rejecters
All Grades	100	100	100	100
1	—	4	—	—
2	—	—	—	—
3	1	—	—	—
4	1	8	—	—
5	—	6	—	—
6	3	6	—	2
7	3	24	—	12
8	6	26	—	8
9	11	26	—	18
10	22	—	29	12
11	13	—	25	14
12	27	—	30	34
13	9	—	7	—
13+	3	—	9	—
Mean grade completed	10.5	7.1*	11.4*	10.0
Standard deviation	2.1	2.0	1.2	1.9

*Figure differs significantly from the comparable figure for Enrollers, using t test of significance at the .01 level; that is, at a difference of this magnitude would occur by chance only about 1 time out of 100.

Table 8. Marital Status

Group	Percent Married
Enrollers	83
College Rejecters (1-9)	86
College Rejecters (10-13)	77
Commission Rejecters.	44*

*Significantly different from figure for Enrollers; see footnote, table 1.

Table 9. Working Members in Households, and Their Relationship to Head

Item	Enrollers	College Rejecters (1-9)	College Rejecters (10-13)	Commission Rejecters
Percent of household heads with one or more other full-time workers in family.	51	64	85*	80
Percent of household heads with one or more full-time or part-time workers in family.	77	80	91	98
1 worker.	52	56	48	56
2 workers	20	22	34	32
3 workers	5	2	8	10
4 workers	—	—	3	—
Mean Number of Workers. .	1.1	1.1	1.5*	1.5*
Standard deviation	.8	.5	.9	.7
Family Members Working:				
Number.	98	53	156	75
Percent	100	100	100	100
Parent	21	16	42	72
Spouse	53	64	36	12
Children	6	6	3	—
Other Member	20	14	19	16

*Significantly different from figure for Enrollers; see footnote, table 1.

Table 10. Total Weekly Earnings of Employed Household Members 1/
(Percent distribution)

	Enrollers	College Rejecters (1-9)	College Rejecters (10-13)	Commission Rejecters
All Earnings	100	100	100	100
Under $25.	—	12	1	4
$25-$50.	66	42	37	12
$50-$75.	21	36	37	22
$75-$100	8	2	11	24
Over $100.	5	8	14	38
Mean Total Weekly Earnings .	$50.83	$51.29	$58.96	$82.90*
Standard deviation	21.59	25.29	26.44	30.05
Median.	44.28	48.50	58.65	89.58*

1/ Average earnings when all working members of household, including the head, were actually employed.

*Significantly different from figure for Enrollers; see footnote, table 7.

Table 11. Number of Dependents per Household 1/
(Percent distribution)

	Enrollers	College Rejecters (1-9)	College Rejecters (10-13)	Commission Rejecters
All Households	100	100	100	100
1 dependent.	22	6	23	56
2 dependents	24	20	16	14
3 dependents	22	16	18	6
4 dependents	9	20	22	14
5 dependents	16	12	7	—
6 dependents	2	6	7	6
7 dependents	—	4	2	4
8 dependents	2	6	3	—
9 dependents	—	6	2	—
10 dependents.	—	—	—	—
11 dependents.	1	4	—	—
Mean Number of Dependents. .	3.9	4.5*	3.3	2.2*
Standard deviation.	1.9	2.6	2.0	1.8

*Significantly different from figure for Enrollers; see footnote, table 7.

1/ Persons, including employed members of household, for whom head assumed responsibility.

Table 12. Housing Situation
(Percent of respective groups)

Group	Renting homes	Moved since inception of projects
Enrollers.	80	16
College Rejecters (1-9).	79	14
College Rejecters (10-13). . . .	67	9
Commission Rejecters	62	14

Table 13. Military Service and Training
(Percent of respective groups)

Group	Had military service experience	Had general education equivalency in Ser	Received training in a trade in service
Enrollers.	61	34	33
College Rejecters (1-9). . .	38*	6*	16*
College Rejecters (10-13). .	38*	9*	22
Commission Rejecters	50	10*	14*

Table 14. Work Experience Outside Tidewater Area

Group	Percent with Experience
Enrollers.	67
College Rejecters (1-9).	24*
College Rejecters (10-13).	39*
Commission Rejecters	30*

Table 15. Training in a Trade in Public School

Group	Percent with Training
Enrollers.	44
College Rejecters (1-9).	18
College Rejecters (10-13).	48
Commission Rejecters	8*

*Significantly different from figure for Enrollers; see footnote, table 1.

Table 16. Trade Experience
(Percent of respective groups)

Group	Had worked at a trade or with a tradesman	With Close friend who works at trade	With relative who works at trade
Enrollers.	64	61	57
College Rejecters (1-9). . .	30*	34*	34*
College Rejecters (10-13). .	46*	62	55
Commission Rejecters	50	48	64

Table 17. Training Choices of Rejecters if Enrolled in Retraining Programs 1/
(Percent distribution)

Trade	College Rejecters	College Rejecters	Commission Rejecters
Sheetmetal Work.	10	14	10
Auto Mechanics	32	19	26
Brick Masonry.	18	23	6
Electronics Technology	18	29	40
Building Maintenance	14	10	6
None of These.	8	5	12

1/ Question not asked of Enrollers.

Table 18. Desired Length of Training Program 1/

	Would have enrolled if program had been shorter		Percent of those who would have enrolled in shorter program, by desired length of program		
	Percent	Number	3 months	6 months	9 months
College Rejecters (1-9). .	78	39	24	42	32
College Rejecters (10-13).	85	88	24	34	42

1/ Question not asked of Enrollers and Commission Rejecters.
*Significantly different from figure for Enrollers; see footnote, table 1.

Table 19: Attitude Ratings 1/: That Training Allowance Was Too Low
(For statements used to assess this attitude, see Table 28.)
(Percent distribution)

	Enrollers	College Rejecters (1-9)	College Rejecters (10-13)	Commission Rejecters
Rating 1/				
All Ratings.	100	100	100	100
2	2	8	31	8
3	3	4	9	—
4.	33	28	36	36
5.	6	6	3	—
6.	56	54	21	56
Mean Rating.	5.1	5.0	3.0*	5.0
Standard deviation	1.1	1.3	1.6	1.3

1/ For description of the Likert sums of ratings scale used here, see pp. 35-36. In the scale, 2 denotes complete disagreement with the stated attitude; 6, complete agreement.

*Significantly different from figure for Enrollers; see footnote, Table 7.

Table 20. Attitude Ratings 1/: That Location of Training Project on College Campus Deterred Enrollments
(For statements used to assess this attitude, see table 28)
(percent distribution)

	Enrollers	College Rejecters (1-9)	College Rejecters (10-13)	Commission Rejecters
Rating 1/				
All Ratings.	100	100	100	100
2.	50	80	74	64
3.	2	4	3	20
4.	17	10	12	10
5.	1	—	1	2
6.	30	6	10	—
Mean Rating.	3.6	2.5*	2.7*	2.5*
Standard deviation	1.8	1.1	1.3	.7

1/For description of the Likert sums of ratings scale used here, see pp. 35-36. In the scale, 2 denotes complete disagreement with the stated attitude; 6, complete agreement.

*Significantly different from figure for Enrollers; see footnote, table 7.

Table 21. Attitude Ratings 1/: That Feelings of Academic Inadequacy Deterred Enrollment
(For statements used to assess this attitude, see table 28)
(Percent distribution)

Rating 1/	Enrollers	College Rejecters (1-9)	College Rejecters (10-13)	Commission Rejecters
All Ratings	100	100	100	100
2	13	26	12	12
3	9	4	11	6
4	28	24	39	48
5	18	16	9	12
6	32	30	29	22
Mean Rating	4.6	4.2	4.3	4.3
Standard deviation	1.4	1.6	1.3	1.2
Number of:				
Veterans	55	19	40	(2/)
Nonveterans	35	31	64	(2/)
Mean rating of:				
Veterans	2.7*	4.0	4.2	(2/)
Nonveterans	4.6	4.2	4.4	(2/)
Standard deviation for:				
Veterans	1.0	1.8	1.8	(2/)
Nonveterans	1.0	1.8	1.8	(2/)

1/ For description of the Likert sums of ratings scale used here, see pp. 35-36. In the scale, 2 denotes complete disagreement with the stated attitude; 6, complete agreement.

2/ Veterans status not analyzed.

*Significantly different from figure for Enrollers; see footnote, table 7.

Table 22. Attitude Ratings 1/: That School Attendance by Older People Violates Cultural Expectations
(For statements used to assess this attitude, see table 28.)
(Percent distribution)

Rating 1/	Enrollers	College Rejecters (1-9)	College Rejecters (10-13)	Commission Rejecters 1/
All ratings.	100	100	100	100
2.	30	30	38	27
3.	2	2	10	24
4.	56	56	32	41
5.	5	4	7	8
6.	7	8	13	—
Mean Rating.	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.3
Standard deviation	1.2	1.1	1.4	1.0
Number of:				
Veterans.	55	19	40	(2/)
Nonveterans	35	31	64	(2/)
Mean rating of:				
Veterans.	3.4	3.6	3.4	(2/)
Nonveterans	3.5	3.2	3.8	(2/)
Standard deviation for:				
Veterans.	1.0	1.0	1.4	(2
Nonveterans	1.2	1.2	1.4	(2/)

1/ For description of the Likert sums of ratings scale used here, see pp. 35-36. In the scale, 2 denotes complete disagreement with the stated attitude; 6, complete agreement.

2/ Veterans status not analyzed.

Table 23. Attitude Ratings 1/: That Retraining Program Was A Form of Relief

(For statements used to assess this attitude, see table 28.)
(Percent distribution)

Rating 1/	Enrollers	College Rejecters (1-9)	College Rejecters (10-13)	Commission Rejecters
All Ratings	100	100	100	100
2.	63	50	59	80
3.	9	10	10	4
4.	28	38	25	8
5.	—	2	4	4
6.	—	—	2	4
Mean Rating	2.6	2.9	2.8	2.5
Standard deviation	.9	1.0	1.1	1.1

1/ For description of the Likert sums of ratings scale used here, see pp. 35-36. In the scale, 2 denotes complete disagreement with the stated attitude; 6, complete agreement.

Table 24. Attitude Ratings 1/: Reluctance to Migrate for Placement If Necessary

(For statements used to assess this attitude, see table 28.)
(Percent distribution)

Rating 1/	Enrollers	College Rejecters (1-9)	College Rejecters (10-13)	Commission Rejecters
All Ratings	100	100	100	100
2.	10	20	14	34
3.	5	2	7	4
4.	40	22	23	44
5.	10	14	8	6
6.	49	42	48	12
Mean Rating	4.8	4.6	4.7	3.6*
Standard deviation	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.8

1/ For description of the Likert sums of ratings scale used here, see pp. 35-36. In the scale, 2 denotes complete disagreement with the stated attitude; 6, complete agreement.

*Significantly different from figure for Enrollers; see footnote, table 7.

Table 25. Attitude Ratings 1/: That Economy Will Reabsorb the Unemployed
(For statements used to assess this attitude, see table 28.)
(Percent distribution)

Rating 1/	Enrollers	College Rejecters (1-9)	College Rejecters (10-13)	Commission Rejecters
All Ratings.	100	100	100	100
2.	40	26	25	40
3.	9	8	17	12
4.	40	44	40	26
5.	4	14	8	2
6.	7	8	10	20
Mean Rating.	3.3	3.7	3.6	3.5
Standard deviation	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.5

1/ For description of the Likert sums of ratings scale used here, see pp. 35-36. In the scale, 2 denotes complete disagreement with the stated attitude; 6, complete agreement.

Table 26. Attitude Ratings 1/: Fear of Placement Difficulties After Training

(For statements used to assess this attitude, see table 28.)
(Percent distribution)

Rating 1/	Enrollers	College Rejecters (1-9)	College Rejecters (10-13)	Commission Rejecters
A. Reservation about utility of training offered:				
All Ratings	100	100	100	100
2.	40	46	45	41
3.	12	2	14	14
4.	25	36	30	29
5.	9	6	6	12
6.	14	10	5	4
Mean Rating	3.4	3.3	3.1	3.2
Standard deviation	1.4	1.4	1.2	1.2
B. Fear of discrimination by employers:				
All Ratings	100	100	100	(2/)
2.	41	48	53	(2/)
3.	18	12	14	(2/)
4.	26	32	23	(2/)
5.	8	4	3	(2/)
6.	7	4	7	(2/)
Mean Rating	3.3	3.0	3.0	(2/)
Standard deviation	1.3	1.1	1.2	(2/)
C. Fear of discrimination by unions:				
All Ratings	3/ 100	100	100	(2/)
2.	22	14	30	(2/)
3.	18	8	14	(2/)
4.	35	48	24	(2/)
5.	8	14	12	(2/)
6.	17	16	20	(2/)
Mean rating	3.8	4.0	3.8	(2/)
Standard deviation	1.3	1.2	1.5	(2/)

1/ For description of the Likert sums of ratings scale used here, see pp. 35-36. In the scale, 2 denotes complete disagreement with the stated attitude; 6, complete agreement.

2/ Question not asked of Commission Rejecters.

3/ Based on 89 usable responses, rather than all 90 Enrollers.

Table 27. Attitude Ratings 1/: That the Unemployed Lack Self-Reliance

(For statements used to assess this attitude, see table 28.)
(Percent distribution)

Rating 1/	Enrollers	College Rejecters (1-9)	College Rejecters (10-13)	Commission Rejecters
All Ratings	100	100	100	100
2.	22	14	16	10
3.	19	30	20	15
4.	41	40	46	63
5.	11	8	13	8
6.	7	8	5	4
Mean Rating	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.0
Standard deviation	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.1

1/ For description of the Likert sums of ratings scale used here, see pp. 35-36. In the scale, 2 denotes complete disagreement with the stated attitude; 6, complete agreement.

Table 28. Percent of Respondents Agreeing with Positive and Negative Statements about Personal and Economic Aspects of Retraining

Item 1/	Enrollers	Rejecters (1-9)	College Rejecters (10-13)	Commission Rejecters
I. Training allowance was too low:				
14a. The training allowance per week for the new program is too little assistance for a family in this area.	93	58	77	92
9b. The government allowance of $25 per week for the retraining program is enough to help a man who really wants to go to school.	40	36	52	40
II. Reservations about location of training project on college campus:				
2a. Going to school on a college campus is out of line for the ordinary person.	30	6	2	12
6b. That men in this community can learn technical skills at a college as well as any place else.	57	96	92	92
III. Academic inadequacy:				
8b. Older men are not able to keep up in school with young people.	32	44	33	22
12a. Older men don't have too much trouble learning new things.	43	56	49	32
IV. Cultural expectations preclude school attendance by adults:				
18a. People would feel funny going back to school after being out for a number of years.	60	60	41	28
4b. People in the church and community approve of older persons going back to school.	83	88	83	54

Item 1/	Enrollers	College Rejecters (1-9)	College Rejecters (10-13)	Commission Rejecters
V. Training program was a form of relief:				
28a. The government program to retrain people is just the same as relief.	23	34	27	10
21b. The government should help a man learn a new trade so that he can get a job.	93	94	85	86
VI. Reluctance to migrate for placement:				
3b. People don't want to leave Tidewater to get work.	70	62	70	18
10a. People don't mind moving from Tidewater to get work.	23	36	29	36
VII. That economy will reabsorb the unemployed:				
1a. Employment will pick up after awhile and all the people will have work.	29	56	40	26
5b. Men will not be able to get work because machines are more and more putting men out of work.	70	74	72	46
VIII. Fear of placement difficulties after training:				
A. Reservations about training offered:				
19a. Even if a man has a trade it is hard to get work.	40	46	26	26
16b. If a man had a new trade, he would then be able to get work.	67	80	73	66

Item	Enrollers	College Rejecters (1-9)	College Rejecters (10-13)	Commission Rejecters
B. Discrimination by employers:				
24a. No matter what trade a Negro learns, industries around here will not take him on.	23	38	21	--
22b. If Negroes can only get good skilled training, they can get good jobs in this area.	74	86	76	--
C. Discrimination by unions:				
11a. No matter how good a craftsman a Negro becomes, the unions will keep him out of a job in this area.	31	54	33	11
26b. Unions in this area are fairly reasonable where Negro craftsmen are concerned.	34	44	48	--
IX. The unemployed self-reliance, or have a "welfare mentality":				
7a. The government should take full responsibility for supporting people who are out of work.	35	38	38	16
15b. If unemployed persons would get out and try harder to find work, unemployment would be cured.	20	28	28	12

1/ The arabic numbers refer to the position of the statement in the interview instrument. Statements were not paired in successive order.

Roman numerals identify the 9 hypotheses that were tested by responses to the paired statements.

TABLE 29

OPINIONS OF MEN CONCERNING BEST METHODS OF SOLVING UNEMPLOYMENT*

	PERCENT OF MEN DESIGNATING SPECIFIED METHOD 1/		
Method of Solving Unemployment	College Rejecters(1-9)	College Rejecters(10-13)	Commission Rejecters
More government retraining programs	50	63	66
Initiation of Public Works Programs by government	24	24	12
Better placement services in the community to better place men according to their abilities	16	18	6
More communications between employed and unemployed persons regarding job openings	16	18	2
More on-the-job training by industry	10	6	6
Other	18	10	14

1/ Some men gave to or more methods.

NOTE: Percents for all tables are rounded.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arensberg, C., et. al. (eds.), *Research in Industrial Human Relations*, New York: Harper and Bros., 1957.

Brazziel, William F., "Portrait of A Young Migrant," *School Review*, Autumn, 1958, pp. 273-281.

Brazziel, William F., "Southern Correlates of Negro Personality," *Journal of Social Issues*, April, 1964.

Brazziel, William F., "Guidance Needs in Scientific and Technical Education," *Higher Education in Science and Engineering*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.

Brazziel, William F.,"Morale Factors in Worker Productivity," *Journal of Human Relations*, Winter, 1955, pp. 87-96.

Brazziel, William F., "Some Influences of Values and Needs on Academic Achievement in A Low Socio-Economic College Sample," *Journal of Human Relations*, Autumn, 1963, pp. 639-649.

Cantril, Hadley, *The Psychology of Social Movements*, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1941.

Centers, Richard, *The Psychology of Social Classes*, Princeton, New Jersey: The Princeton University Press, 1949.

Chinoy, Ely, *American Workers and Their Dreams*, New York: Doubleday, 1955.

Davis, Allison, *Social Class Influences on Learning*, Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1948.

Dunbin, Robert, *The World of Work*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958.

Educational Policies Commission, *Education and the Disadvantaged American*, Washington: National Education Association of the United States, 1962.

Edwards, Allen, *Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction*, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1957.

Fenlason, Ann, *Essentials in Interviewing*, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952.

Havighurst, Robert, Paul Bowman, Gordon Liddle, Charles Matthews, James Pierce, *Growing Up in River City*, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962.

Hollingshead, August, *Elmtown's Youth*, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1949.

Hyman, Herbert H., "The Value Systems of Different Classes: A Social Psychological Contribution to the Analysis of Stratification," in Bendix, Reinhard and Lipset, Seymour M., *Class, Status and Power*, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1953.

Jones, Alfred W., *Life, Liberty and Property*, New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1941.

Bibliography

Knupfer, Genevieve, "Portrait of the Underdog," in Bendix, Reinhard and Lipset, Seymour M., Class, Status and Power, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1953.

Lambert, William W. and Wallace E. Lambert, Social Psychology, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Company, 1964.

Lynd, Robert and Helen M. Lynd, Middletown, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1929.

Miller, S. M. and Frank Riessman, "The Culture of the Underprivileged: A New Look," Paper presented before the American Sociological Association, New York, 1960.

____________________________, Social Problems, Summer, 1961, pp. 86-97.

Miller, Daniel and Guy E. Swanson, Inner Conflict and Defense, New York: Henry Holt, 1960.

Riessman, Frank, The Culturally Deprived Child, New York: Harper and Company, 1962.

Riessman, Frank, Worker Attitudes Toward Participation and Leadership, (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1955).

Ryan, Bruce and Neal C. Gross, "The Diffusion of Hybrid Seed Cord in Two Iowa Communities," Rural Sociology, 1943, No. 8, pp. 15-24.

Sears, Robert, Eleanor Maccoby and Harry Levin, Patterns of Child Rearing, Evanston: Row, Peterson and Company, 1957.

U. S. Department of Commerce, Statistical Abstracts of the United States, 1962.

U. S. Department of Commerce, U. S. Census: Virginia Detailed Characteristics, 1960.

U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Income and Education in Neighborhoods (Birmingham and Washington, D. C.), 1963.